

The Republican.

No. 12. VOL. 14.] LONDON, Friday, Sept. 29, 1826. [Price 6d.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE WILLIAM VENABLES,
LORD MAYOR OF THE CITY OF LONDON.

MY LORD MAYOR, 62, Fleet Street, Sept. 28, 1826.
I HAVE a joke to crack with your Lordship's Magisterial Worship, on the subject of the fracas at the last meeting of the Christian Evidence Society. To me, it is ever a matter of pleasure, to see men in office saying something about infidelity to Christianity, &c. I could wish to see them rational on the subject; but I had rather have nonsense than silence from them. They may call us, Infidels, "mad," if they please; but our madness is not of the kind that excites their real pity. They fear us, not with a fear of bodily harm, but with a fear of mental contrast. They bow to the superiority of our honesty and ability, whenever the subject comes before them; and, like the ostrich, that hides its head in a hole to defend its body from the pursuer, they cloak their dignity in an affected pity that is pitiable in its turn, and in an affected contempt that betrays fear and consciousness of inferiority, rather than a dignified sense of superiority and a confidence of wisdom in magisterial precept. "Mad," as we are called, the magisterial authorities dread discussion with us. Before I proceed further, I will copy a report of proceedings before you, as I have found it in different newspapers, and shew the unfairness of the proceedings, or the report, by a statement of facts,

MANSION HOUSE.

CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE SOCIETY.—Yesterday, the Justice Room, and the avenues to it, were crowded in consequence of the interest excited by a complaint, which Mr. Cope, the City Marshal, had to make against some of the members of the Christian Evidence Society, which meets at Founders' Hall Chapel, in Lothbury, to discuss the subject matter of the New Testament. This Society has been established by a Mr. Taylor, who cuts a very extraordinary figure in the streets of London, being seen constantly parading the most public places, with a reverend hat and a glass suspended from his neck by a broad blue riband. He has had meetings in various parts of the town, but the proprietors of the houses where the Society used to assemble had very few trials of its respectability, before they made the most determined efforts to get rid of it altogether. At last Mr. Taylor got hold of the present spot for its meetings, to the great terror and annoyance of the inhabitants of Lothbury. The Lord Mayor has received a

Printed and Published by R. Carlile, 62, Fleet Street.

great many communications from his fellow-citizens, complaining of the disgraceful conduct of those who attended the Society on the nights of meeting, and requesting his interference to put a stop to the proceedings. His Lordship however, for obvious reasons, refused to attend to this request; but he directed that the Police should keep an eye upon the Society, in order to prevent breaches of the peace, to commit which some of the members were extremely well inclined.

Two young men, named Freeman and Godwin, disciples of Mr. Taylor, and who regularly claps a "*Reverend*" before his name, were brought before his Lordship; the first charged with having assaulted Mr. Cope in the execution of his duty, and the second with having endeavoured to rescue his assailant.

Mr. Cope stated, that on the previous evening a great riot took place at the Chapel, and he attended for the purpose of restoring peace. The Rev. Mr. Taylor was speaking, and there were several other persons at the same sort of employment. The greatest confusion imaginable arose, in consequence of what fell from the speakers, and there were upwards of a dozen at a time fighting about the platform where the principal speakers were assembled. Witness immediately went in amongst them, and said he was an officer; that such conduct could not be allowed, and that they must desist. He observed Freeman particularly active; took hold of him, and said he must come away. Freeman, however, instantly collared him—a scuffle ensued, and witness fell under the seat, where he was repeatedly struck. He lost his hat, and the clothes were almost torn from his back. About twenty people got round him the moment he took hold of Freeman, and Godwin was amongst those who rescued that person from his custody. By the assistance of an officer, however, the two were apprehended. The scene was one of very great violence.

George Goodge, a city patrol, confirmed this account. He succeeded in getting hold of Freeman after the rescue, and he held him fast.

Cowton, the officer, stated, that he was in the room while the disturbance was going forward. He saw a sword drawn from a stick by a short man, with red hair, who had been speaking on the subject of the Resurrection. He saw Mr. Cope in the midst of the disturbers, and upon running to his assistance he found the man with the sword was gone. There seemed to be a great deal of activity in a person, who was running up every now and then to the Chairman, who stood in the pulpit, with written communications. This person seemed to be doing all he could to secure the person who had the drawn sword in his hand.

A Solicitor, the master of Godwin, told the Lord Mayor, that he believed the identity of his clerk was doubted.

Mr. Cope—Not in the least; I have a perfect recollection of him.

Freeman—My Lord, the fact is this—yesterday evening I attended the Christian Evidence Society, and, my Lord, there were two sitting in the same box (pew) hissing as hard as they could. I told them if they were dissatisfied, they would have an opportunity of answering, but to be quiet. One of them was a gentleman that sent a letter to the Editor of "*The Republican*" against Ministers and Christianity, and he got up at the Meeting to attack Mr. Taylor, which was the worst sort of hypocrisy. I said he was a hypocrite to attempt to defend what he had written against in "*The Republican*" for Mr. Carlile; and he said, I deserved to be knocked over head. I didn't like to be bullied, and I told him to do it—when he drew his sword, saying that he had a sword to defend himself. There was then some scuffle. I did all I could to get the sword out of the hand of the person who drew it upon me, but I declare most positively I never struck the Marshal, nor any body else.

The Lord Mayor.—I suppose the arguments caused a great deal of clamour.

Freeman.—There was a great deal of approbation and disapprobation.

The Lord Mayor.—I suppose, Sir, that you are a Deist?

Freeman.—I don't pretend to be any thing at all, my Lord—don't pretend to understand any thing about the subject.

Godwin.—I went in to hear what was going on in company with my cousin and I saw the man draw the sword; I did not get into the row, for I said I'd indict him under Lord Ellenborough's Act.—(a laugh.)

The Lord Mayor.—Aye, that was because you are a lawyer!

Freeman.—We acted only in defence. The sword cane was brandished over our heads.

Mr. Cope.—I had no chance with such a multitude. When they got me down, some of them were knocking me about the head, while others were pulling me by the legs.

Godwin.—We merely attended to see what was going on. We had no idea of a row, until we heard the shrieks of the women, and saw the Gentleman with the sword, who is an opponent of Mr. Taylor; he professes Christianity, and he carries a sword to show it.

The Lord Mayor (to Godwin's master)—Is this the way in which you complete the education of your clerk, by allowing him to go to places of this description?

Solicitor.—No; I deprecate meetings of the kind as most infamous, and I knew nothing of his going there.

The Lord Mayor (to the defendants). Are you of the Committee?

Freeman.—No, my Lord; I only went in for the third time. I am certainly acquainted with the Rev. Mr. Taylor.

The Lord Mayor.—I have had repeated applications made to me to put a stop to the proceedings of this Society, upon the ground that they were always opposed to Christianity, but I have always refused from the belief that contempt would bring all attempts of the kind to their proper level. I have no doubt of the insanity of Taylor, but madmen of his description will always find crack-brained followers; I only regret that the youthful may be misled by such a description of persons. Christianity has nothing to fear from such objects. It has triumphed amidst the most desperate opposition, and under the most disheartening circumstances, and can suffer nothing in the hands of such men as are now ranged at the bar—a laugh.—(To the defendants.) You must find bail however for the assault and rescue.

The sister to one of the defendants—Nobody, my Lord, can say, that my brother was clamorous. He applauded Mr. Taylor, but the question was one that was as immaterial to him as to me.

The Lord Mayor.—Oh, then, you consider the question of no importance to you.—Are there any of the Society here who would wish to say anything?

John Henderson, a baker of Deptford.—I was present, my Lord Mayor, when the uproar was going forward; and when Mr. Taylor exposed the argumentation of the individual, and censured the letter which the individual wrote to the Editor of 'The Republican,' he drew a sword. I leaped up to get at the sword; that was the cause of the disturbance, and we all did what we could to put an end to it.

The Lord Mayor.—It never occurred to you that this individual with the drawn sword was one of the *Dramatis Personæ*. Without opposition, the performance would have been nothing. Oh, you are just what I expected you were—a sad set altogether.

The Solicitor—The object of the Meeting was highly censurable, and my clerk ought not to have gone there; but I submit that he was a casual, idle spectator, and seeing his relation attacked, he wished to protect him.

— Broadhurst, a grocer in Clare-market, said he had a few words to say.

Mr. Cope—That Gentleman, my Lord, is one of the speakers.

Broadhurst said, he had made a few observations upon the conduct of those who made the noise.—He declared that he had seen neither of the defendants concerned in the row.

The Lord Mayor—Is the Chairman here?

Mr. Brown, a wine-merchant, in Savage-gardens. I was Chairman; I saw no sticks at work I declare, but that in which was the sword. We were in quiet discussion until a party came to disturb us.

The Lord Mayor—This is got up to take 6d. a piece out of the pockets of fools.

Mr. Cope—The members are constantly causing disturbances in the neighbourhood; they stay till two or three in the morning, and make the most hideous uproar.

The Lord Mayor—The inhabitants ought to indict the house as a nuisance.

A person in the Justice-room. I assure you, my Lord, that the blasphemies of Taylor cause all this disturbance; it is impossible to hear them with patience.

The Lord Mayor—Every one must feel disgust, but that Taylor is mad I have no doubt in the world.

In making observations on this report, I shall, first, have to complain of the conduct of the reporter, second, of Cope, the marshal, and third, of you, the Lord Mayor.

First.—The report is not fair. It is not a representation to the public of that which really happened at the chapel, nor of that which was really said at the Mansion House. It is so manufactured as to attempt to throw odium on those who attend the chapel. But as it respects the observations put into the mouth of Cope and your Lordship, we must take them as yours and leave you to settle the matter with the reporter.

The managers of the Christian Evidence Society have sedulously endeavoured to maintain the best of order, in the course of the discussions. They are chiefly mild, sober, respectable and moral people, detesting what is called a row, and aspiring to sobriety of manners and discussion. All the disturbances that have been made in this society's meetings have been made by a few ruffianly disposed christians, who have gone there for the purpose of disturbing those arguments which they can find no one to answer. This was well known to you, my Lord Mayor, it was well known to Cope the marshal. Soon after the meetings at Founders-hall Chapel commenced, a disposition having been shewn on the part of some of the Christians to disturb the proceedings, a constable was hired for the purpose of being called in to suppress any violence of manners. Cope, the marshal, finding such an officer there, asked him by what authority he attended and ordered or

desired him not to attend. This circumstance is disproof of what your Lordship is made to say about a desire to preserve the peace. If you had such a desire, Cope had not. He has more than once gone there insolently, and by forcing his way through where others respect, without stating his authority, has created disturbance. His deposition, that he was thrown down and beaten with sticks, is totally unwarranted. The members of the society strenuously supported his authority, while he suffered the man, who had drawn the sword and created all the riot to escape; took a person into his custody who must have been glad to see him there, and got another confined at the Compter for remonstrating on such conduct. There are suspicions, that some Christian ruffians were authoritatively sent there for the purpose of creating a disturbance. There were many little bands scattered about the chapel on tuesday evening apparently acting in concert, and one of them was busy, alternately taking notes of what was said by the Reverend Mr. Taylor, and making or inciting others to make a noise. Was this taker of notes sent there by any authority?

Cope's observations that the members of the society stay until two or three o'clock in the morning, and that they make at those hours hideous noises, so as to disturb the neighbourhood, are utterly false. Are there no watchmen in Lothbury? Could such hideous noises be made and the parties escape the watch-house?

Now, my Lord Mayor, we must have a word or two about the *madness* of the Reverend Mr. Taylor, his "crack-brained followers," and about Christianity. The Reverend Gentleman would gladly stake his logical insanity against your Lordship's logical sanity or against the Christian sanity of your Lordship's Chaplain. You know well, that he is not mad, not so mad as Paul was when he stood before Festus. Madness is a common charge upon strong argumentative opponents. Your Paul was magisterially pronounced to be mad. I have been pronounced mad by the Dorchester Magisterial Christian Ruffians, when they found that they could neither subdue me by severity of imprisonment nor by the arguments of such priests as they could persuade to try their powers with me.

You say that you have "no doubt of the insanity of Taylor." Have you a doubt of your own sanity? Can you conceive in what sanity of mind consists, since we are ignorant of the basis of every thing about us? My notion of insanity is, that we are all insane; that a sane mind has not yet existed; so, at least, let us be charitable toward the insanity of each other. Insanity, in a philosophical sense, is correspondent with ignorance; in a physical sense, it expresses a loss of knowledge once acquired, from a diseased state of the brain and nervous system: can you show that the Reverend Mr. Taylor has lost any knowledge he once ac-

quired? Or rather, in the acquisition of knowledge, does he not daily emerge from the character of insanity to that of sanity? It is an insult to the country, when a magistrate insults an individual from a magisterial chair; it becomes an aggravated insult, when the individual is not present; but when on the part of a magistrate that insult consists of the vilest slander, the act becomes criminal. It would be doing you justice, if the Reverend Mr. Taylor were to indict you for having uttered what the law in other cases calls an atrocious libel. You have wantonly libelled his character and condition in society, and you have done this in a place that should be sacred to justice, in a seat, where a magistrate should be more prone to hear and soothe the irritations of all parties than to chatter nonsense, and to make strife between them.

Though you refuse to persecute other than by slander, though you merely truckle to an established system, when we have some reasons to conclude that you despise it; we, on our side, must not let such attacks, such comparatively harmless persecutions, as these, pass unnoticed. We call for free discussion and mutual improvement; and while we discuss freely, we must assert our right and duty to chastise magisterial insolence if thrown upon us. I deem your office respectable, more respectable than that of the hereditary monarch; but the most respectable of offices may be disgraced by the manners of those who fill them. I have no general complaint against you; my complaint is particular and confined to the circumstance of the little insults which you throw upon the Reverend Mr. Taylor and the proceedings of the Christian Evidence Society; but, as an enemy to all religion, I feel bound, with a press at my command, to defend all who approach to my disposition, from the effects of foul, unnecessary, and unwise attacks.

The cause of the disturbance, beyond what the Christians or Christian authorities premeditated, was this. A regular opponent of the Reverend Orator brought me a piece of Hudibrastic poetry, for sale, which was a severe sarcasm upon the Christian religion. It was printed in No. 11 of this volume. On Tuesday last, the friends of the young man, who thus acted, were offensively, even outrageously, clamorous; when, to illustrate their sincerity and good intentions, the Reverend Orator began to read and to comment upon the article in question. His remarks goaded the young man who left the poetry with me almost to madness, and he drew and brandished a small but long sword, which had been concealed in a stick, one of those which are commonly sold in the streets of London. The Chapel was immediately thrown into a state of confusion, and it is difficult to collect the particulars of what passed during the confusion. Women shrieked and fainted and the men were engaged in a scuffle, which ended without any particular injury. If the officers, who

were present, did receive blows, they were not meant as resistance to their authority to preserve or restore the peace, but were the accidents of a turmoil of that kind. The principal offender was in their custody and allowed to escape. These are the particulars, as far as I have been able to collect them from several persons who were present.

The joke is to come. You tell us that "Christianity has nothing to fear from such objects; and that contempt will bring all attempts of the kind to their proper level." The authorities of this country have shewn more fear than contempt of the opponents of Christianity, and it was not until they had been beaten at all points, even from the gaols in which they incarcerated us, that they began to substitute "contempt" for persecution. A man never feels contempt for one whom he has failed to subdue. Hate he may; but he must fear. You say that Christianity has triumphed in the midst of the most desperate opposition. It was never desperately opposed. It grew up as other delusions have grown up, and now that it is calmly and philosophically discussed, it flies like chaff before the wind, like foul air before the sun. There are no converts from philosophical infidelity to Christianity; but there are hundreds daily making from Christianity to philosophical infidelity. The books which I publish are actively read, and are every where producing the desired effects. The thing is done quietly; but it is done effectually. The affair is decided; Christianity cannot effectually oppose its opponents. It is shewn:

First, That no such person as Jesus Christ existed; that the name, and tale of the name, is allegorical and fictitious; and that the very basis of Christianity is fabulous.

Second, That the Jews, whom the Christians hold to have been the chosen people of the most powerful God, and their predecessors, are proved to have had no existence as a nation, or if so, unknown where, three thousand years ago; while other nations, splendid, powerful, and happy, can be shewn to have existed ten thousand years ago.

Third, that every human theory of a god is baseless, when referred to the reality of the things about us, to the whole of which we form distinctive parts.

These are the difficulties of infidelity, which Christianity has to surmount and these are insurmountable. A worn out edifice, of common bulk, is not removed in an hour; but that does not render the removal impossible. Christianity is fast receding from the minds of mankind. It is not respected where it is fairly examined; and though the change must be unpleasant to the Christian authorities, as the change from paganism was to the pagan authorities, and as all changes are to all authorities, still it must take place. The divine charm of christianity is gone from this country and the mere ceremonies of the religion must follow

it. Better things are being prepared for us; a state of things that will enable man to benefit more by his labour and less by his prayers, and not let the prayer thrive, while the labourer starves.

We do not deem it sufficient, that the Christian authorities do not prosecute us; but as far as we make ourselves respectable, we will call upon them to respect us. We have no pretensions beyond those of human improvement; never were men less profitably disposed to maintain a principle than they who now oppose Christianity in this country. They are but few who have made a profit of it: and even they have purchased that profit with much pain and labour; but there are hundreds among them who have made great pecuniary sacrifices, great sacrifices of domestic happiness, to assert the right of free discussion upon the subject of the Christian religion. Having established that right, having put it in practice; they will make even the Lord Mayor of London respect it: and he shall not jeer their pretensions without being made ashamed of it.

You represent the followers of the Reverend Mr. Taylor as crack-brained and express regret that young people should be drawn to hear him. There are but few young people who attend Founder's Hall Chapel, save those who come by the immediate direction and under the care of their parents. As to their being crack-brained, I have the pleasure of an acquaintance with most of them, and shall be proud to try the soundness of their brains in conversation with the congregation at the Reverend Mr. Winter's Chapel of which you make one. The cracked-brains are those who follow a delusion, not those who discuss the merits of all delusions. Our brains were cracked with the superstition imposed upon us in our youths, but we have repaired them and have put them in the best possible order. Now, we rend your cracks, for the purpose of probing them, and make you smart while we exhibit your Christian errors.

You represent the exhibition at Founders' Hall Chapel as a scheme to collect sixpences from the pockets of fools. Do not fools put out their sixpences to support the chapel of the Rev. Mr. Winter? Do you go there without putting out your sixpences? These chapels bring expences with them, and, if attended, must be supported. The rent of Founders' Hall Chapel is sixty pounds for the year. Expences, independent of salary to Mr. Taylor, must approach to another sixty pounds. To hold the Chapel, this sum must be collected; and if they are fools who contribute their sixpences, they are not so foolish as the fools who attend Mr. Winter's chapel; for they do get something worth the hearing; some useful knowledge for their sixpences, which you and fellow fools, at Mr. Winter's chapel, do not get for your sixpences.

This imputation of "madness" and "crack-brained" comes very ill from men in authority. There are legal ways of dealing with such people; and how is it that your Lordship has never

had any of these "mad, crack-brained" people brought before you to be legally dealt with? One of the young men, who was locked up in the Compter on Tuesday night, was detained for remonstrating with Cope, the Marshal, on his conduct in detaining the other, not knowing his authority. Respectable bail was offered for them both; and why was it refused? Magistrates and others in office should see nothing but the law and breaches of the law: they should not judge of opinions nor of the common sectarianism of mankind: they should not join parties.

I exhort you, my Lord Mayor, to better behaviour in future: and though, comparatively speaking, you are not a fool of the first order, do not slander men who have more knowledge than you have; do not, in your magisterial capacity, trundle to the support of a party: and Christians, now, are but a party in this country.

RICHARD CARLILE.

MR. CARLILE.

SIR,

THE annexed song was suggested by the somewhat romantic incident in the Founder's Hall drama of last Tuesday evening. If deemed worthy of a place in "The Republican," the writer would be happy to see it there.

Yours respectfully,

A LOVER OF TRUTH.

A SONG FOR THE SAINTS.

TUNE—*All the blue bonnets," &c.**

PRAY! pray! Collier and Irving, pray!

Fletcher and Hartwell Horne, pray to Jehovah!

Pray that he'll not take our sweet Holy Ghost away,

Who with fair Mary once revell'd in clover!—

Bid him, in holy songs,

Send us more cloven tongues,

* For why, as Saint Rowland Hill says, should the Devil have all the good tunes?

So shall we learnedly preach in good order ;
 Satan, Christ's kingdom shocks,
 Bow's blessed steeple rocks !—

All the blasphemers are over our border !

Charge, charge, Chester and Durham, charge !
 On, gentle Owen, and Osnaburgh's royal saint ;
 Lucifer's empire is growing infernally large—
 Let not the holiest heroes of Zion faint ;

Come, Canterbury !

Rise, York, in fury !

Lead on your legions to war in good order—
 George, whom we love so well,
 Send Zion's foes to Hell,
 Gracious defender of Zion's fair border !

March ! march ! knight of the fiery head,
 Forward, thou sanctified second St. Peter ;
 Jaded by Reason, thy rapier draw instead,
 What to thy *kind* heart than blood can be sweeter ?

Brother, so perfect grown,

Thee for our chief we own—

Come, gentle Jesuits, forward in order,

Southey, in loyal lay,

Shall sing the holy fray,

When Zion's hypocrites fight for their border !

A PERSON of the name of Tonquet has been condemned by the Court of Correctional Police at Paris, to nine months' imprisonment, and a fine of 100 francs, for having published what he called the *historical* and *moral* portion of the Gospels, without the miracles or supernatural occurrences which afford the evidence of the Saviour's divine mission. No charge of perversion or blasphemy was laid against the defendant. He was accused only of mutilating the sacred volume.

MR. COBBETT.

SIR,

It is really too bad. We have a serious charge against you. Scarcely a week passes without some insinuation against us from your pen. How can we refrain from accusing you of *beastly ingratitude*, for know, Sir, you are under the greatest obligation to us? Without our support, your Registers would not be worth reading: deprived of us, your arguments would be as feeble as those found in the *broad sheet*. And yet strange it is, you not only insinuate that we are frequently *false*, but you even sometimes assert that we are so. At other times you express doubts of our being true; although it is absolutely impossible in all cases, and at all times, that we should be false. It is true, we are liable like yourself to be shamefully misrepresented. There are false statements of us; there are distorted accounts of us; but to apply the epithet *false* to us, is as absurd as to talk about "false" truths. You, Mr. Cobbett, who write so forcibly against injustice; you who write lessons for the use of statesmen, ought surely to do justice to every word and thing. In future, therefore, learn to do us justice. Your very last Register of the 23d September, says we are "false."

So far from that, we are most truly, Sir,

Your faithful servants,

FACTS.

NOTE.—I do not understand what the writer of the above means, unless it be to shew the grammarian and grammatical critic that he occasionally makes *grammatical* as well as other errors.—R. C.

BARON MASERES.

To Mr. Carlile, for "The Republican."

OBSERVING among your list of books one entitled, "Lives of Persons who have written against Superstition," I send you for insertion in "The Republican," and afterwards, if you please, among the Lives, the following anecdotes of the late Baron Maseres, of whose will Mr. Cobbett has given such a ludicrous account in a late Number of the Register.

Francis Maseres, Cursitor Baron of the Court of Exchequer, was the son of a French Protestant, and began his scientific career at Cambridge *about* the year 1753. He was a pensioner of Clare Hall, and made a considerable figure in mathematics; he was educated to the law, and made Baron of the Exchequer, solely from his merits as a Barrister. He was Plenipotentiary at Quebec, and held many other offices of respectability. But it is not my intention here to give the details of his life, which I can furnish on a future occasion, if you wish it for the "Lives," &c. but to confine myself in this short notice in "The Republican," to his religious opinions; and I can do this in an authentic manner, from the recollection of the frequent discussions I have had with him respecting the pretended truth of Christianity.

Baron Maseres had the reputation of being what is commonly called a Unitarian, and he used to avow it, and excuse himself for a certain old-fashioned habit he had of going to Church, by saying, "That God knew how sincerely he scorned and reprobated the absurd contradiction of the Trinity, and could also duly appreciate his political motives for an apparent acquiescence in the religious forms of his country." He laughed heartily whenever the doctrine of the miraculous conception was named; and used to call Jesus Christ the *Carpenter's Son*. In his many arguments with me on the truth of Christianity, he always was temperate, and said that he was a very philosophical Christian: but being at last beaten in the arguments which he set up for the existence of a providential God and a divine Viceroy on earth, he used to say, "Well, well, I am aware of the difficulties a believer has to encounter, and of the powerful nature of your objections, but it amounts to this—I *like* to believe it, and I like to believe it with as little superstitious absurdity as possible, and therefore I

have *chosen* for my little creed these short declarations: I believe in one God, (not in three, and one at the same time!) maker of heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ, son of Mary and the Carpenter, whom God has sent." Again: "I consider Jesus Christ as endowed by God, by some to me unknown means, with the power of telling mankind what is best for their happiness; and I denounce all mystery and superstition in matters of religion as not only absurd, but as mischievous, and diverting the mind away from the pursuit of truth into the mazes of error." He went on to say, "For the same reason, I have written a book against the existence of the negative sign in algebra, as being a ghost of the imagination; and for the same reason, I dissuade young mathematicians from reading Sir Isaac Newton's "*Principia*," it being an unintelligible work, and one that I could never understand in my life."

Now, the worthy Baron forgot, that like the turkey in Gay's Fables, he could see the fault in others which he overlooked in himself; and that his believing in the divine legation of Jesus Christ could be classed among no other set of ideas than those very notions he so strongly condemned in the Church of England people. He agreed with me in the probability, that eternal space was filled with worlds, and the inhabitants of worlds—and yet did not see the absurdity of this *great source* of all this boundless and eternal theatre of animal life, descending to instruct a Carpenter's Son, in one of the smaller planets of a certain solar system, lying between Sirius and Arcturus, in the method of bringing the inhabitants of the said planet to a state of salvation!!! As he grew older, his religious absurdities were strengthened, and exhibited, though in a less degree than most people, a striking example of the recurrence of the early impressions made on infancy, during the gradual decline of old age. This principle in the animal economy, of the forcible recurrence of early-acquired ideas in old age, at a time when more recent impressions are obliterated, illustrates the cause of what is called a death-bed repentance in matters of religion, and explains why people, who have turned Deists and Atheists in their manly vigour, have died Christians and recurred to the absurd belief in supernatural things, which were impressed on their lively and inquiring infantine minds; and it shows how careful we ought to be to guard against wrong notions in children.

Baron Maseres wrote many political tracts, all which tended to support the cause of liberty. He was a prodigious admirer of Milton, the poet; and used to say he was sure that Milton was not a Trinitarian, a thing of which Milton's posthumous work, *On the Christian Doctrine*, has since convinced the world.

Milton indeed was at least a Deist, if not an Atheist. His manner of confounding Jehovah with Jupiter, and Jesus Christ

with Pan;* and his frequent habit of introducing Jesus Christ and Orpheus† into the same scene in a poem; and often confounding, or at least putting together the polytheistical divinities with the ghosts of the Jewish and Christian mythology—shews, that he did not really distinguish between the metaphorical character of the one set of emblematical personifications, and the alleged truth of the literal interpretation of the other. A man of Milton's judgment and caution, if he had *really believed* in the religious scheme of Judaism and Christianity, would never have written such absurd poems as "*Paradise Lost*" and "*Paradise Regained*," lest in so doing he should unwittingly commit some blasphemy and be damned for it!!! Baron Maseres used to quote Milton, Locke, and Sir Isaac Newton, as examples of *Unitarian believers*; but I trust I can shew, that Chaucer, Spenser, Bacon, Shakspeare, Milton, Locke, Newton, and indeed all the great poets and philosophers of those *believing* ages, were as much Deists as the philosophers of our *disbelieving* age are—and as people still rely more on authority than trust to reason in matters of faith, it might be doing science a service to develop the truth of my assertion, which I may perhaps do hereafter.

With respect,

AN OCCASIONAL CORRESPONDENT.

Sept. 22, 1826.

P. S. Observe, I am not an Atheist in relation to physical nature, but only in relation to superstitious mythology; I am a believer in *Matter*, *Vitality*, and *Intelligence*, as eternal necessities, and as constituting the real Trinity: in short, a *Somatopsychonologist*, and I shall defend this doctrine against fanaticism.

* See the Hymn on the Nativity, &c.

† See Lycidas, a monody, &c.

MACHINERY AND POPULATION.

WHEN any new view of things is brought before mankind, it must be expected to receive much opposition. There are always prejudices to be overcome; and to these men are generally so warmly attached, that arguments, the most convincing to an unprejudiced mind, often fail to make any impression upon them. This obstinate attachment to preconceived notions, is not always, as might be expected, the result of real or supposed interest; it often exists in the minds of individuals who cannot have the least interest in the question at issue. What interest could medical men have in opposing Harvey's new view of the human frame, his theory of the circulation of the blood? Yet they opposed it for years, almost to a man, in spite of the convincing arguments adduced in its favour, and the circumstances of which they must have been aware, and which must have satisfied an unprejudiced man at the first glance. This attachment to prejudices is perfectly unaccountable. I have somewhere read of an instance in some town in France, where it was proposed to remedy the nuisance of throwing all the filth of every description into the street; but the inhabitants exclaimed *en masse* against the innovation, against depriving them of the privilege of having their streets as dirty and unwholesome as they could make them; and even some medical men who were called upon, in the hope that their evidence would quell the opposition of the inhabitants, to give their opinion of the effects of the filth on the atmosphere and health of the town, actually declared that it was beneficial. We have ample proof, that such attachment exists, and that it is injurious; but it is of no use to lament it, we must do the best we can with it; we may do with it as an old woman does with her corns—pick out a bit at a time, till the whole is destroyed. The remedy is practicable in both cases, and if properly followed up can scarcely fail of being effectual.

The people of this country have for many years been in the habit of considering machinery and bad government as the sources of want of employment and consequent misery among the lower orders. These are deeply-rooted prejudices, and are retained by many very intelligent persons, though so evidently fallacious to the careful and candid inquirer. There is in this case some excuse to be made, seeing that it requires a comprehensive mind to view the matter fully, and that there is such a variety of causes tending to produce the effects attributed to machinery and bad government.

In Numbers 6, 9, and 11, of "The Republican," a writer has argued as well as he could in favour of those prejudices, and, I

doubt not, much to the satisfaction of a large portion of his readers, for "fellow feelings beget sympathy;" and it is because I conceive that the greater number think as J. F. thinks, that I now write. If I thought that the majority were free from the prejudices attempted to be supported by J. F., I should not notice his remarks; but as I know this is not the case, I am inclined to do the best I can to clear up the matter, although more competent hands have gone before and will probably follow me. It is the last shot that opens the breach, but each well-directed one contributes towards it. I speak confidently on this subject—first, from a firm conviction after a patient and unprejudiced inquiry; and secondly, because I have never yet been in frequent collision with any individual whom I did not convince that my view of it was correct.

The propositions stated by J. F. are:—

1. "That the use of machinery reduces the quantity of employment for human beings.
2. "That the (assumed) great increase of population is not the cause of the present distress.
3. "That increase of population cannot be the cause of *any* distress.
4. "That the '*great increase of population*' is a piece of political twattle. And,
5. "That the present and all other public or national evils, except earthquakes and a few other natural phenomena, are to be traced to *misgovernment*."

I shall first state and endeavour to demonstrate a few propositions in opposition to these; and then show the want of demonstration in the arguments of J. F. I shall make my propositions as general as possible. I am not writing for the Government, nor for any other party, as a party; I am not anxious to *throw out a tub to the irritated whale*, that is, in plain language, to withdraw my fellow men from seeing the real source of their evils, as J. F. has thought proper indirectly to charge upon his opponent F. P.; my only desire is to establish a true, and therefore useful, view of the state of mankind. My object is truth and utility, let it favour what party it may. My propositions are:—

1. That machinery, or any other discovery that lessens the quantity of labour in the production of any commodity, is beneficial to the happiness of mankind.
2. That the "great increase of population" is not "a piece of political twattle," but a fact supported by the universal experience of past ages by an unprejudiced view of the present, and by a scientific view of the productive powers of the human race.
3. That a redundant population must at all times be productive of distress.
4. That a redundant population is the *principal* cause of the present distress. And,

5. That the increase of population is the primary cause of bad government and its constant support ; and hence that bad government and distress among the people, are effects of the same cause.

1. THE GREATEST HAPPINESS OF THE GREATEST NUMBER is now the leading sentiment of philanthropy. No partial interests, no monopolies, can now be countenanced by the enlightened philanthropist. His object is the happiness of the human race; not the protection of the claims, falsely called rights, of a few individuals, who would enjoy happiness at the expense of the society to which they belong.

Happiness is something indefinite, a something to which we may continually approximate but never reach. The best or nearest definition that can be given of it is, that it is the gratification of desires. The more we can gratify our desires, the happier we are. Man naturally desires ease, but he has many other powerful desires to prompt him to action. He desires to live independent of labour, and he desires food for subsistence and clothing to guard him against the inclemency of the seasons. These are his principal desires. Now he must be most happy when he can gratify the latter desires at the least expense to the former—when he can obtain the necessary subsistence and comforts of life with the least labour.

Let us suppose a community of one thousand persons, and that to obtain the necessities of life they are compelled to labour twelve hours a day. If they discovered machinery that would enable them to do the same labour, to produce the same commodities, in eight hours a day, would it not be beneficial to their happiness? It is evident that it must. It would allow them so much more ease; or if they still had desires ungratified more strong than the desire of ease, they would have so much more time to labour for their gratification. Thus then the direct tendency of machinery is to lessen the quantity of labour necessary to the gratification of our wants; and, therefore, gives us the means of increasing our happiness—gives us the power of gratifying more of our desires than we otherwise could.

It matters not whether the community consist of ten persons, ten thousand, or ten millions; the discovery of means to lessen labour must ever be beneficial to the happiness of mankind. It is a great good that can be introduced into a co-operative society without any painful result, but cannot be introduced into a society of individual competition without producing a small portion of evil. It is this small portion of evil that is brought forward as the objection to its introduction. But is it not a generally received maxim, especially in the science of morals, that the lesser evil must be borne to obtain the greater good? Once make it a law that no innovation shall be made injurious to an individual, or a

few individuals, and then good-bye to every valuable improvement.

The evil effect complained of is the throwing hands out of employ in those trades into which machinery is introduced. This it may do in some cases, but F. P. has clearly proved that it has not been the case in the cotton trade, on which it has been principally charged. It would throw hands out of employment in those trades where there would be no extra demand for the commodities produced when sold at a lower price; but in some cases, it is evident, lowered price would so far increase the demand as to keep on more hands with machinery than without it. But this is a point I shall not enforce. I will grant that the introduction of machinery may throw men out of employment in any particular trade. But then *the demand for labour is not lessened on the whole*. If the introduction of machinery enable me to purchase clothing for five pounds that would otherwise cost me ten, I have the extra five pounds to purchase something else: and therefore I create a demand for labour in another quarter.

"But the man who made your cloth may not be able to make what you wish to purchase." True; but if there were no redundancy of labour before, there will be none then. The clothiers, out of employ in their own trade, may not earn as good wages in another; but that is an accident to which all labourers are liable, from other causes as well as the introduction of machinery; for instance, change of public taste which often causes a falling off in the demand for some articles, and a greater demand for others.

To the assertion that the introduction of machinery does not lessen the demand for labour, an opponent may start the following objection:—Suppose it takes the labour of ten men to produce a certain commodity, which by the aid of machinery can be produced by two; and that the expense of the machinery, say a steam-engine and coals for its support, is equal to the labour of three more. In this case the commodity will be sold for half its former cost, and the other half may produce a demand for labour in some other direction; but as there are but two employed in the old line instead of the ten, and but the demand for five in the new, is there not a decrease in the whole demand for labour of three-tenths?

We shall soon see the fallacy of this objection. I notice it particularly because I think it is a stumbling-block to many who make but a slight examination of the subject of machinery.

The price of any commodity is regulated by the cost of its production; the cost of production is regulated by the quantity of labour employed. This is universally the case wherever there is free competition. Now the machinery is a commodity, and its cost, whatever it may be, is value given for labour; and instead

of three-tenths of the demand for labour being lost, which is supposed in the above objection, they are only transferred to other trades—to the iron-workers, the machine-makers, and the colliers. Iron is of no value in the mine, nor coal in the pit, nor chalk in the hill, nor water at the spring; but they may be all made of value by the application of labour, and their value will be in proportion to the labour applied. The only difference between the hand of the labourer and machinery as applied to the production of any commodity is this: the latter is labour applied mediately, the former is labour applied immediately.

Hence the demand for labour is not lessened by the introduction of machinery; because the demand is not for any limited quantity of commodities, but for all the commodities that a certain quantity of labour can produce.

2. That there is a power in mankind to increase their numbers is evident from the fact that there are more in existence at this time in this country than there were twenty years ago, notwithstanding so many thousands have been slaughtered in war. If they possessed no power to increase their numbers, the population of this country must be considerably less than it was at the end of the last century. And be it remembered, that political economists are philanthropists, and calculate on the powers of man when exempt from war, famine, disease, and death. They wish their fellowmen better things than these, and their object is to teach them how they may be obtained. They see that the human race has ever been subject to these direful evils, because there has ever been the same cause in operation to produce them; and the necessity of removing this cause, is what they would impress on the minds of their fellow-citizens.

An unprejudiced view of the history of this country must convince any one of the existence of the principle for which I am contending. The number of inhabitants on the invasion of the Romans must have been small indeed compared with the present. There is no means of ascertaining what the number was, but as the people derived their principal subsistence from fishing and hunting, it is evident that it could bear but a small proportion to the number now existing. We have no record of a people being very numerous under similar circumstances. It is only in countries where agriculture is the principal occupation of the inhabitants that we find a thick population. The invasions of the Romans, the Saxons, and the Danes, must have destroyed, judging from the history of their exterminating wars, more of the original inhabitants than they replaced. The population of England at the arrival of the Normans has been calculated at about two millions.—(*See the opinion of the Lord Chief Justice Hale, quoted in "Place on the Principle of Population," p. 190.*)

In the commencement of the reign of Edward III. a most dreadful plague visited this country. It is thus mentioned by

Hume :—" But a sudden damp was thrown over the festivity and triumph of the Court of England, by a destructive pestilence that invaded that kingdom, as well as the rest of Europe; and is computed to have swept away a third of the inhabitants in every country that it attacked. It was probably more fatal in great cities than in the country; and above fifty thousand souls are said to have perished by it in London alone. This malady sensibly depopulated every country through which it passed."—It has been calculated that 100,000 persons died of this malady in London; for by an inscription on a stone-cross that remained when Stowe wrote, 50,000 were buried in one piece of ground, purchased by Sir Walter Manny to take what the churchyards would not suffice to bury. (*See Place, &c. p. 207.*) It is strange that Hume should state the deaths at about 50,000, and then in a note mention this burying ground without a doubt as to the number there interred.

Notwithstanding this terrible plague, the numbers continually carried off by epidemics in large towns, and the multitudes which in every reign fell a prey to internal and external wars, we find that in the reign of this same Edward, the population had increased to upwards of 2,300,000. (*See Chalmers' estimate on the poll-tax*). In the reign of William and Mary, the population had increased to at least 5,000,000, according to the estimates made on the returns of inhabited houses. The returns of the population in 1801 gave a total in England and Wales of 10,472,041; and in 1811, of 11,911,596, exclusive of those serving in the army and navy. (*See Miller's Con. of the Hist. Eng.*)

As the increase was thus great under so many disadvantageous circumstances, what must it be under circumstances in all respects favourable? Poverty, misery, disease, and premature death, have been the almost constant attendants on the labouring class. There have been a few short respites; circumstances have sometimes bettered the condition of the labourers; but generally a large portion of them have been on the brink of starvation. If in such a state they produced children as fast as when in comfortable circumstances, it is evident that but few of them could be reared to maturity.

It is well known that America repeatedly doubled her population in less than twenty-five years. Now, although America has possessed many advantages in favour of procreation, it is evident that she has not possessed all that a nation *may* possess. She has an ample store of rich land, easy of cultivation; her artisans have been well paid; her government has been economical, and she has contained but few unproductive consumers; but she has been engaged in wars, and her citizens have yet to learn much concerning the best methods of rearing children and preventing diseases. Hence we must allow that a society of human beings, in the best possible circumstances, could procreate faster than

the Americans have : but as they received some assistance from emigration, we may put this as a balance against the want of the "best possible circumstances," and say that mankind, all things favouring, can double their numbers in twenty-five years.

"That the rate of increase in the numbers of mankind depends upon the constitution of the female, will not be disputed. The facts, which are fully ascertained in regard to the female of the human species, with the additions which the sciences of physiology and comparative anatomy enable that knowledge to derive from the analogy of other animals, the anatomy and physiology of which resemble those of the human species, afford the means of very satisfactory conclusions on this subject.

"The females of those species of animals that most resemble our own, when placed in the most favourable circumstances, are capable of a birth every year, from the time when the power of producing begins till the time when it ends, omitting a year now and then, amounting to a very small proportion on the whole.

"Let us make such ample allowance for the female of the human species, as shall include all interruptions. Say one birth in two years. In Europe, to which we may at present confine our observations, the period of child-bearing extends, from sixteen or seventeen, to forty-five years of age. Let us make still more allowance and say it extends only from twenty to forty years of age. In that period, at the great allowance of two years to one birth, there is time for ten births, which may be regarded as not more than the number natural to the female of the human species.

"Under favourable circumstances, the mortality among children is very small. Mortality among the children of very poor people, is unavoidable, from want of necessary means of health. Among the children of people in easy circumstances, who know and practise the rules for the preservation of health, the mortality is small; and there can be no doubt, that, under more skilful modes of managing the food, clothing, air, exercise, and education of children, even this mortality would be greatly diminished.

"We may conclude, therefore, that under the most favourable circumstances, ten births are the measure of fecundity in the female of the human species : and that, of the children born, only a small proportion would die before the age of maturity. For occasional instances of barrenness, and for this small degree of mortality, let us make much more than the necessary allowance, a deduction of one half, and say, that every human pair, united at an early age, commanding a full supply of every thing necessary for physical welfare, exempt from the necessity of oppressive labour, and sufficiently skilled to make the best use of their circumstances for preventing disease and mortality among themselves and their progeny, will, one with another, rear five chil-

dren. This being evidently the case, it is needless to exhibit an accurate calculation, to show that population would double itself in some moderate portion of years. It is evident, at once, that it would double itself in a small number of years." (*See Mill's Elem. of Pol. Econ., Chap. II. Sect. 2.*)

These are perfect demonstrations of the fact, that there is a tendency or power in the human species to multiply their number rapidly. In other words, that were mankind in such a situation as the philanthropist would wish them, so situated as to enjoy the greatest possible portion of happiness, they would increase their numbers in a geometrical ratio, of which each term would comprise, at most, not more than a period of twenty-five years.

3. But procreation after the above rate, and the permanent happiness of mankind, "are objects perfectly incompatible with each other." A nation, such as America, under peculiarly favourable circumstances, may go on doubling its numbers every twenty-five years for a few centuries, without feeling any ill-effects from it: but misery must overtake it in the end, except it employ some methods to check this natural tendency.

The happiness of a society, as I have before shown, depends upon the quantity of the objects of desire that they can procure. Now the production of these objects depends upon labour and capital. With a constant supply of labour and capital, production may go on increasing as long as the earth would bear any improvement. But when labour or capital fails, production is restricted. Thus if labour be as 20, and capital as 10, there will be no more produced than if labour were but as 10; and if capital be as 20, and labour as 10, there will be no more produced, excepting a substitute be found for labour, than if capital were but as 10.

It has been shown that labour (population) has the power of doubling every twenty-five years; but it is evident that capital cannot increase in the same proportion. Capital consists of savings, or unconsumed production. It is allowed by political economists that capital may increase in an arithmetical ratio, namely, as 1, 2, 3, 4, &c.; which upon an examination will be found a greater allowance than the case warrants; but as labour increases in the ratio of 1, 2, 4, 8, &c., it is clear that there must be a portion of it of no use in production. Hence proceeds what is called a redundant population, that is, more labourers than can find employment.

Thus a community must be in one or the other of the following states:—Either its population is restricted by artificial means to the increase of capital, and the people are comparatively happy; or it is restricted to this point by natural means, by poverty, misery, disease, and premature death. There is an exception to be made in favour of infant communities, so fortunately situated as to be able to acquire capital rapidly. But this is but an excep-

tion for a time, as the capital cannot continue to keep pace with an unrestricted population. The power of labour to increase is a constant quantity ; it is the same, and as powerful, after completing a hundred terms of the ratio as at first ; but the power of capital to increase continually grows weaker : for being applied, as it must, to less and less productive soils, it leaves less and less for accumulation, or above the demand for immediate consumption.

On a reference to history we find a lamentable deficiency of information respecting the labouring class ;* but almost as certain as we find this class mentioned, there is an allusion to its being suffering for want ; that is, that there was not a sufficiency of employment for all who demanded it, that there was, in the language of political economy, a redundant population.

That a *redundant* population must at all times be productive of distress, is so evident that it seems absurd to argue the point. If there be not such a number as to be injurious, there is not a redundancy. When the supply of labour is greater than the demand, the value of labour is depressed, and not only the surplus number of labourers are sufferers, but all the class ; the whole are pressed downward to the brink of starvation, and the weaker, to the amount of the redundancy, are thrown over. The people were never yet starving but from a redundant population ; and there never yet was a redundant population from which starvation did not ensue.

We have one remarkable instance in the history of this country of the effects of lessening the supply of labour. After the great plague in the reign of Edward III., which is calculated to have destroyed one-third of the inhabitants of this country, the value of labour rose immensely. Acts of Parliament were passed to regulate the price of labour, but all to no purpose ; for if the bargain could not be made one way, it was made another. The capital remained the same, while one-third of the supply of labour was lost, and a competition among capitalists necessarily arose. It was not likely that A would willingly allow his capital to remain unproductive, while his neighbour B had labour at the parliament's price ; A would naturally adopt some plan to entice away the labour from B, as A had better make little profits than none.

Such a state of things is the grand desideratum for the labouring class ; but the philanthropist does not wish to see it brought about by plagues, nor by any other evil, because it may be done

* Jusqu'ici, l'histoire politique, n'a été que l'histoire de quelques hommes ; ce qui forme véritablement l'espèce humaine, la masse des familles qui subsistent presque en entier de leur travail, a été oubliée.

CONDORCET.

as effectually by simple means, by a systematic restriction of the number of births.

4. A redundant population, as I have before stated, means a surplus of labour above the demand for it. When we say that the country is suffering from a redundant population, we mean, that there are labourers who cannot find employment. When such is the case for any length of time, a large portion of the labouring class, is reduced to poverty and its concomitant evils.

Now what are the causes of the present distress, if want of employment be not? The fact is evident, that there are thousands upon thousands of labourers now destitute of employment; and it is equally evident that if there were none out of employ, if the supply of labour were less than the demand, that the present distress would not exist. There would be a competition among capitalists, the wages of the labourer would supply him with the comforts of life, and the nation would be, compared with its present state, happy.

Thus, then, as I have shown that the present distress could not exist in the absence of a redundant population, it is clearly demonstrated *that a redundant population is the principal cause of it*. When a man feels a pain in his foot, which ceases when his shoe is taken off, and when he has experienced this repeatedly, does he not rationally conclude that the shoe was the cause of the pain?

Some persons may object to this conclusion, on the ground, that though a redundant population be the immediate cause, it is not the principal cause; that this redundancy is occasioned by the bad institutions of the country, and therefore that these ought to be considered as forming the great evil to be removed.

This is an error as old as the suffering of men in society. Whatever have been their sufferings they have attributed them to their institutions, principally to government. Governments have never yet been what they ought to be, they have been productive of many evils, and their subjects, generally incapable of embracing a clear view of an extensive question, have attributed to them evils over which they had no controul. The effects of mis-government on population are confined to this point: if two communities start in their career, one under good government the other under bad, but in all other circumstances alike, the latter will sooner acquire a redundant population than the former: that is, the latter, its government being less congenial to the accumulation of capital, and the power of labour to increase being the same in both, will not support the same number of persons as the former. But since, in spite of the best possible government, except the power of labour to increase be restricted to the power of capital to increase, every community must eventually suffer from a redundant population, it is evident *that mis-government*

is not the principal cause of this redundancy. It merely hastens that which would arrive were it not in existence.

5. But it is almost beyond the line of possibility that a good Government should exist with a redundant population. This redundancy and misgovernment are effects of the same cause; not both *immediately* resulting from the primary cause, but both being points in a sequence of effects naturally following each other.

In order to illustrate this position, I shall suppose a community starting in its career under a good Government, and possessing all other favourable circumstances. While labour and capital increase together, the distribution of their joint products, or as it is generally termed, the distribution of wealth, will be about equal among all its members.

As the increase of labour begins to exceed the increase of capital, the ratio of distribution begins to vary. Labour loses a portion of its value, which is acquired by capital. The competition, instead of being between the capitalists, which alone can produce any thing like an equal distribution, is between the labourers. As this competition goes on, the share of the labourer is decreasing, and the share of the capitalist is increasing.

As the capitalists are but a small body of men compared with the labourers, a large portion of the production of the community falls into few hands. A few persons accumulate immense wealth; but their accumulations cannot be called capital, because they are not applied to reproduction, but accumulated to be consumed. While the same cause exists, the same effects follow. Some, to use a common phrase, make their fortune and quit the field of business; others enter it and finally do the same.

The persons, thus favoured by an unequal distribution, form a separate class, having but few interests in common with the rest of the community. They possess wealth; they feel their wealth to be power; and they naturally wish to make use of it. It is in the nature of man to desire consequence, to be something great in the eyes of those around him. The individuals, of this favoured class, can increase their consequence only by taking the command of others. Therefore, as their wealth enables them to usurp the reins of government, it is pretty certain that they will do so.

Self-interest is the governing principle of man. When his actions are conformable to the interests of his associates, he feels that such a line of conduct will be most beneficial to himself. Thus all men acting for the interest of a community, the members of all Governments should have their own interests inseparably connected with the interests of those for whom they act. Now a Government composed of wealthy individuals, has very few interests in common with the mass of the people, and is thus naturally unfitted for the station it holds.

Instead of governing by equitable laws, such a Government will seek only its own interests; to acquire and protect, for itself,

exclusive privileges ; and to maintain its power by keeping up its stock of wealth. The members of a Government thus composed of a particular class, feel it their interest to rob and otherwise oppress those whom they govern ; and feeling it their interest to do so, it follows as a natural consequence that it will be done.

I repeat what I have elsewhere said on this subject :—That this is a chain of events or effects, flowing from the same cause, is as evident as that rain is occasioned by the evaporation of moisture from the earth. To prove the last effect from the primary cause, some intermediate steps are required ; but these discovered, the proof is evident. Evaporation, the rise of the aqueous vapour in the atmosphere, the loss of caloric, partial condensation, the formation of clouds, their descent towards the earth, further condensation, and fall in the shape of rain, form a sequence of events allowed by all the scientific of the day ; but this, evident as it is, is not more evident than that the above is a natural train of events flowing from an excess of population. Were evaporation to discontinue, rain would cease ; and were there no excess of population, no power in mankind to increase their numbers faster than the increase of capital, misgovernment would soon cease also.

Hence, then, it is evident, that removing a bad Government, is not striking at the root of the evil. It is only like topping a weed, the root of which has the power to shoot forth again. Is he not considered a bad gardener who tops his weeds instead of drawing their roots ? No one can be more inimical than myself to bad Governments. I wish to see them all annihilated. But I do not wish to mislead my readers by telling them that misgovernment is the cause of all their evils, when I know the contrary to be the fact. I wish to call to their attention the primary cause both of their distress and misgovernment. I want to see them striking at the root of all their evils, endeavouring to remove the great obstacle to their improvement and happiness. Let men endeavour to reform or destroy bad Governments, but let them not think that such will do all that is necessary to be done for their happiness : for if they do so think, they will be sadly disappointed.

I have already extended my article so far that I have but little space for my promised remarks on the arguments of J. F. ; but I will bestow a few lines on some of the most prominent—those on which J. F. seems to lay most stress.

Arguing on the effects of machinery, J. F. says, at p. 172, “ Show me that the whole mass of labourers and operatives throughout the kingdom, are better off, that they have more of the necessaries and comforts of life than formerly, and I will give up the point immediately.”

Were there no causes affecting the happiness of the labourer, but the introduction of machinery, J. F. would be right in draw-

ing his conclusions from the present state of the people; but as this is not the case, he rests for proof on a fallacious ground. I once heard an argument somewhat similar advanced against the good effects of education. *See*, said my opponent, *the people are worse off than before those schools and cheap publications were in existence.* But will J. F. presume to assert that the operatives of this country were never reduced to the verge of starvation, before the general introduction of machinery? If he cannot, what becomes of this position? If they were so reduced before the general introduction of machinery, and that they most assuredly were, is it not evident that causes independent of machinery might have reduced them now? I am persuaded that J. F. is an honest inquirer on this subject, and that he will see that to give or take the point on this position, is rather an insult upon fair inference. I think also that J. F. will yet be convinced that any method, that lessens the cost of production, must be beneficial to the happiness of a community.

"Machinery," says J. F., "might, unquestionably, be employed for the advantage of the labouring part of the community, but is it so employed?" In this sentence, if I mistake not, J. F. allows the power of machinery to better the condition of mankind, but would have us believe that this power is misapplied, that it benefits only a few persons. Whom, then, does it benefit? If those who manufactured goods by the aid of machinery, sold them as dearly as when manufactured by direct labour, they alone would be benefitted; but as the less cost of production is allowed in the selling price of the article, the purchasers, one and all, share the benefits.

"Aye, but all cannot be purchasers." Perhaps not. But could they be purchasers, if no machinery had been introduced, if the articles had retained a high price? I have already shown that if there be no redundancy of population before the introduction, that introduction cannot create it: for the demand for labour remains undiminished, and when machinery lessens the quantity requisite in one line, there is a demand for it in some other.

J. F. asserts, that the present amount of taxes could not be collected in the absence of machinery. I grant all he has said of the misapplication of the taxes, and that 10 millions instead of 60 would be more congenial to the welfare of the people; but whether they could or could not be collected without the co-operation of machinery, is a point on which I am not satisfied, though I am inclined to believe, with J. F., that they could not. It is my object to show that on J. F.'s supposition that machinery enables a nation to pay taxes, it must have a beneficial tendency.

The capability of a nation to pay taxes, depends upon the quantity of its productions. If it produce no more than will support the producers, it can pay no taxes; or if, in such a case, it should pay any, if it should be compelled to support any unproductive

consumers, a portion of its producers must perish. This result is inevitable. The British nation, at the present time, cannot pay its 60 millions of taxes and support all its members, and consequently want and disease are found among them. If all its taxes were remitted, the nation would revive, there would be more employment for labourers, and things would bear a better aspect, till population again pressed upon the means of subsistence. By the natural course of things this period would soon arrive, and then there would be no 60 millions of taxes to take off to remedy the existing distress. Thus if the absence of machinery would leave the nation destitute of the means of paying its taxes, its presence must be beneficial—as every thing that advances man's powers of production must be considered in this light.

The writer of the extract, quoted by J. F. from "The Courier," did not understand the subject on which he wrote. He saw the advantages of machinery in increasing the means of subsistence; but mistook the effect of a redundant population, for an effect of the introduction of machinery. He did not see that machinery does not lessen the demand of labour. I have granted that a partial evil attends a sudden change in the direction of the demand for labour; and this is the only evil, of which I am aware, that can attend the most extensive use of machinery, which is, it will be recollected, only labour mediately applied. J. F. may find a plenty of paragraphs in the newspapers and elsewhere to support his view of the question; as there are, unfortunately, many literary men who study but very little of first principles, and are incapable of taking an extended view of any subject; but I would advise him not to be led by the opinions of others, but to examine for himself. He acknowledges that he lacks information: let him read Smith, Malthus, Mill, and Place.

It is immaterial to the argument whether the number of persons employed in the cotton trade be now greater or less than it was before the introduction of machinery; because other causes may have contributed to such a change; and because the fact, that machinery does not lessen the demand for labour, cannot be proved by the number of labourers in any one branch of production.

J. F. speaks of the comparative comfort of the labourers of former days, and in one place mentions "thirty years ago," as a time when "mothers could buy three-and-sixpenny cottons;" that is, if I mistake not his meaning, that thirty years ago the people were better off, none out of employment, no distress. If such were the case, the people of thirty years since were very inconsistent; for there was a universal complaint of distress among them at that period; "bread! bread! give us bread!" were the cries that thirty years ago greeted George the Third as he went to the House of Commons, and were generally repeated throughout the kingdom.

I shall not defend the random supposition of F. P. concerning the number of people two thousand years since ; but is the supposition of J. F. more reasonable? He thinks it probable that there were 30 millions of people in this country at the time alluded to by F. P. Whence could they derive subsistence? Could the proceeds of their partial agriculture, the river and the chase, support such a number? Common sense and the history of the world, prove the supposition an absurdity.

Speaking of the increase of population in America, J. F. says, "every one knows that that extensive, fertile, and comparatively well-governed country, has been continually receiving a great influx of new inhabitants." And he then asks, "Has this circumstance escaped F. P.'s observation? or did it appear to militate too strongly against a long-cherished and darling theory?" Now J. F. ought to have known that this "great influx" has not escaped the notice of political economists, but that it has been ascertained from the American statistics, and granted in its utmost extent. If he have not read generally on the subject, he ought not to have charged a supporter of political economy with wilfully neglecting a fact in opposition to his "darling theory." If his reading have been general, he knows that political economists have not done so; and in this case his insinuation is still more unworthy of an apparent inquirer after truth. Do I go too far in supposing that there is a little too much of presumption in the composition of one who first states that he has obtained but little information on a particular subject, and then charges those who have studied it deeply with being merely supporters of "a chimaera conjured up for political purposes?"

I now come to the main point in J. F.'s last letter—his objections to the geometrical ratio of political economists. If there be, and I have shewn there is, a power in mankind to increase their numbers, and if that power be not checked, the progress of population must be in this ratio. The time it would take to complete each term of the ratio, is another question. It is now reasonably stated at twenty-five years, and on this is founded the progressive table of F. P.; and it is on his conception of this table that J. F. has *shown* his want of information on the subject.

This progressive table is intended to show what *would be* the progress of population, if in no way obstructed, and not what it is under the natural course of things, not what it is when wars, want of food, and bad management of children, send so many beings to the grave without reproducing their like. If the present number of mankind had increased like a sum of money at a given interest, we could, by a retrospective calculation, like that of J. F., ascertain when the human race began; but its increase has not been uniform, although the power to increase uniformly exists, because obstructions have been continually operating to prevent it: want, misery, disease, and premature death, have, as

I before said, sent many to the grave who could have contributed to this increase; and the dread of these evils has likewise operated to check the natural propensities of many of the living.

I should be sorry to impute a dishonest motive to J. F.; but this retrospective argument leaves me but one conclusion—that he did not see its weakness, did not adopt it merely to obtain an apparent victory over F. P. in the opinion of the prejudiced, but that he is sadly deficient of information on the subject.

For the satisfaction of J. F., I can assure him that he is not the first who has taken this erroneous view of the doubling ratio. When, conversing with persons who had not previously studied the subject, I have mentioned the natural power of mankind to increase, I have often been asked how it is that their numbers have not so increased hitherto. But this objection I never failed to remove by a few observations on the many checks that have combined to prevent it; and I flatter myself that J. F. will yet see its futility: for I still consider him an honest inquirer, only a little deficient of information, a little too presuming, and a little too free to insinuate that persons to whom he is opposed in opinion are actuated by unworthy motives.

J. F. asserts that a redundant population was never even dreamed of till within these few years. I refer him to the extract from Swift, printed in No. 7. of the present volume of "The Republican;" and I would ask what could have been the prevailing idea, at any period of past times, when employment could not be obtained, but that there were too many people? If there were any reasoning on the subject such must have been the conclusion. Will J. F. trust to the authority of a poet, and such a poet as Goldsmith? This "dreamer" on the state of his country not only says

"A time there was, ere England's griefs began,
When every rood of ground maintained its man;"

which is as glaring a falsehood as ever was put upon paper; but

———"that states, of native strength possest,
Though very poor, may still be very blest;"

and also in the dedication of this poem that he sincerely believed all he had written. That is, he declared that this kingdom had at some time contained, according to J. F., nearly 300 millions of inhabitants, and that poverty was beneficial to the happiness of the people! The principal drift of the poem is to prove that the accumulation of wealth is injurious to the increase of mankind. One, so ignorant of the causes that contribute to the prosperity of a nation, does not deserve notice.

But to the fact. Was the population decreasing in the time of Goldsmith? The population evidently increased during the last century, and what circumstances are there to favour the supposition that it decreased during any period of it? I have read the history of the century, and I know of none that operated peculiarly at the middle, or during the early part of the reign of George the Third. Yet on this supposition J. F. founds an argument against the "principle of population;" and would have us believe that he has drawn its supporters into a dilemma from which they cannot easily escape.

"If any of my readers, says J. F., are not convinced of the absurdity of this ratio of increase, namely, that population doubles itself or has a tendency so to do, every twenty-five years, let him attend for a moment to the following statement." He proceeds to show what would be the number of inhabitants, taking the number at the invasion of Julius Cæsar at one million, at different periods; and because such numbers have not existed, concludes that the power of producing them never existed.

This is a mere repetition of an argument of which I have before shown the fallacy; but as he concludes his last letter so confidently on the strength of it, I give it a short notice.

Suppose, then, that fifty years before the Christian era, the number of inhabitants was one million. Now, on the principles of political economists, in order that this number should double in twenty-five years, there must be no war, there must be an ample supply of all the necessaries and comforts of life, the people must be well acquainted with all the arts necessary for their protection from external injury, that is, be comfortably housed and clothed, and acquainted also with the best arts for the preservation of health and the rearing of children, finally, that the capital of the country must have doubled in the period alluded to. Did these circumstances attend the Britons of the time of Julius Cæsar? If they did not, the argument of J. F. is destitute of foundation. Is it necessary to repeat again that the calculation of an increase of double in twenty-five years, is founded on the supposition that mankind enjoyed all these and all other favourable circumstances?

Philanthropy desires for man all that could make him happy. Philosophy teaches that all this cannot be acquired for all the human beings that may be produced. Hence when philanthropy and philosophy meet in the same individual, they naturally prompt him to enforce this important truth: that all who may be born cannot be happy, and, therefore, in order that all that are born should be happy, the number of births must be restricted.

Surely there can be none who would not prefer the happiness of a few, to the misery of many. But if the restrictive system were adopted, more could be brought into existence to live happy

than could otherwise be supported in any shape. With a demonstration of this fact, I shall close my remarks.

The possible increase of population depends upon the increase of capital. There are many ways in which the restrictive system would contribute to this increase, but I shall confine myself to one. Under the present system, half, that are born, die before arriving at the age of maturity. Under a restrictive system, very few would die before this age: but, to make an ample allowance, say that one fourth would reach maturity. Hence, under a restrictive system, a saving may be made of all the expense attending the births, support, and deaths of one-fourth born under the present system, and as this saving would be so much increase of capital, or of subsistence for those who may be born, it is evident that the nation could support a great many more under a restrictive system, than it can under the present system. All that is expended on children that die before the age of maturity, or, in other words, on the production of labour beyond what is necessary to supply the demand, is so much capital lost, so much destroyed of the means of happiness to human beings.

R. H.

Subscriptions for MESSRS. PERRY, CAMPION, and CLARKE:—

	s. d.		s. d.
Mr. Bickley	1 0	W. T.	2 0
Mr. Pattinson	0 6	D. C.	1 6
Mr. Burgess	5 0	Mr. Jackson	7 6
R. H.	1 9		

J. G.'s half-year's interest of fifty pound subscription to the	£ s. d.
Joint Stock Book Company	1 5 0
Mr. Greatrex's ditto of five pound subscription	2 6

T. R. Perry thankfully acknowledges the following subscription from Sleaford by the hands of Mr. J.—

	s. d.		s. d.
A Friend	5 0	Mr. J.	2 6
Mr. R. Storey	2 6		

Printed and Published by R. CARLILE, 62, Fleet Street.—All Correspondences for "The Republican," to be left at the place of publication.